

10760

A
L E T T E R
T O
Sir Fletcher Norton, Knt.

Speaker of the House of Commons.

[PRICE SIX-PENCE.]



A
L E T T E R
T O

Sir Fletcher Norton, Knt.

Speaker of the House of Commons,

On the Petition of

THOMAS DE GREY, Esq;

AND OTHERS,

As inserted in the PUBLIC ADVERTISER, on
Friday the Eleventh Instant,

FOR WHICH

The PRINTER was ordered to attend
the HOUSE, on Monday, Feb. 14,

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. WHEBLE, in Ave Maria Lane,
Three Doors from Ludgate-street.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED

THE ACT OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS



AND OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED

THE ACT OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

A
L E T T E R
T O .

Sir Fletcher Norton, Knt,

S I R,

IT was the complaint of a predecessor of yours of bullying memory, that—"The poor abuses of the times wanted countenance."—You are determined that, as far as your art and power can extend, (and in your situation they extend very far) no similar complaint shall be made in our days. Almost every passage of your Life would justify me in this assertion. But I am led to it more particularly at present by your conduct in the House of Commons last Monday, in most scandalous violation of the dangerous trust reposed in the Speaker by that too easy and too inattentive House.

Perhaps, Sir, you may be at a loss to guess what circumstance I allude to: For God only who knows (and indeed seems alone to regard them) can tell how many tricks of the same kind you are daily practising.

tising. I will therefore inform you. I mean your shameful behaviour to Sir Edward Astley, and to the whole House of Commons, when he would have presented two petitions to the House. I say, when he would have presented them *to the House*: For you contrived to prevent that, and to have them presented only *to yourself*. Though you need not information, I will mention the circumstances: For, though I address this letter to you, it is evident from its contents that my *Intention* is to expose you by informing others.

This language, Sir Fletcher, does not guard nor dissemble. I mean to give you every advantage by my words: For I am desirous to know, though at my own peril, at what stage of political destruction this country is arrived; and whether those who dare be guilty of the most infamous practices, dare yet by their own voluntary act invite their public notorious canvass. Montesquieu has somewhere observed that nations often remain free by the spirit, long after the principles of their constitution are destroyed. That our constitution and all the remedies it afforded us against oppression are gone, I know. Now, Sir, I want to see, by the steps you may think proper to take with this libel (for I acknowledge

ledge

ledge it such, if truth can be so) whether you imagine that the spirit is fled also; and that the time is now come when government may pull off the mask, and tell us plainly that they will no longer indulge us with the privilege we have for some time past enjoyed only at their discretion, the miserable privilege of Perillus's Tortured, to complain.

But, to the fact.

On the 6th of last month, Mr. Tooke, a gentleman of Norfolk, was informed by a note from Mr. Edward Barwell, one of the clerks of the House of Commons, that he expected shortly to receive from Mr. De Grey, one of the members for Norfolk, a petition to the House of Commons for leave to bring in a bill for inclosing, &c. certain common lands in a parish where Mr. Tooke had an estate. Which petition Mr. Barwell promised Mr. Tooke he should see before it was presented. This was the first notice of an intention of any application to Parliament.

On Sunday the 23d Mr. Tooke received, at his house in Surrey, a note from Mr. Barwell, inclosing a copy of the intended petition; in which the Chief Justice likewise joined. This petition was to be presented the very next day.

At

At this short notice Mr. Tooke came to town on Monday morning early ; prepared hastily a counter-petition ; and waited on Sir Edward Ashley, his representative, requesting him to deliver it.

Sir Edward, with his usual regard to justice, impartiality and honour, consented to deliver it ; in the same manner as he had previously consented to deliver his colleague Mr. De Grey's petition : That so the House might take them both into consideration together. But not presuming himself sufficiently acquainted with the little forms and ceremonies of the House, he informed the Speaker of the circumstance ; and desired to know whether he (Sir Edward) could with propriety present two petitions which were directly opposite to each other. Sir Fletcher affected to think it very unusual, improper and extraordinary. And indeed it is probable Sir Fletcher did think it extraordinary that there should still be left in the House a man so impartial, just and disinterested as to present two Petitions affecting the property of his constituents, without taking part on either side.

Sir Edward however persevered in the line of his duty, and very properly communicated to the relations of Mr. De Grey
(who

(who was himself in Norfolk) the contents of Mr. Tooke's counter-petition; that they might not be surprised even by him whom they had meant to surprise, nor have any pretence to reproach Sir Edward with being deficient towards them even in the minutest punctilio.

When Mr. De Grey's relations saw Mr. Tooke's counter-petition, they were most probably shocked themselves at the glaring light in which the injustice of their own attempt was placed by it. They therefore withdrew their Petition; and soon after framed another. And on the 2d of this month, Mr. Tooke was favoured by Mr. Barwell, with a copy of the new petition; which was directed to be delivered on Friday the 4th.

Mr. Tooke was therefore again forced, at this short notice, to come to town and prepare a new counter-petition. Accordingly on the Friday, Sir Edward would have presented the two petitions; but the Speaker stopped him, and was then of opinion that petitions of that particular kind should be presented in a *fuller House*. Sir Edward acquiesced to the reason; and the following Monday, the 7th, was fixed on by Mr. De Grey for delivering his petition, declaring that he would himself come from Norfolk, and be present at its delivery.

Accord-

Accordingly on Monday last Sir Edward offered them *both together* to the House, with that modesty which, though it does him honour, yet gives such men as Sir Fletcher Norton the advantage he took of it.

"This is very extraordinary," said Sir Fletcher, "Could the gentleman ask you to deliver his counter-petition? Did the gentleman ask you to do it? Ho, ho! Well, it is very extraordinary. You must bring them up then. But bring the first petition first."

Mr. De Grey's petition was then received: and some member crying out, "Hear, hear," and one part of the House beginning to give attention; the Speaker turned round to them, and said aloud, "It is only a common petition for a common inclosure," upon which wilful falsehood and premeditated trick of the Speaker, the House (as is usual when mere matters of course are going forward, only preparatory to the business of the House) began talking again, and heard no more. The moment Mr. De Grey's petition was read, the Speaker instantly muttered in a low voice, and as hastily as possible, "All you that are for the question, say Aye; all you that are against it, say No; the

the Ayes have it. Now bring up the other."

Mr. De Gray's petition being thus smuggled upon the House by the Speaker, and the whole business decided by him, (without one single member having said aye or no, and without any one of them being aware of it or knowing it) the counter-petition was then read over (such is the Speaker's regard to forms and common sense) against the passing of that question which was already passed. And this petition against the doing what was already done, was nevertheless ordered by the Speaker to lie upon the table. Very good sense and great honesty in your occasional pretended forms, Sir Fletcher!—"You cannot present a counter-petition first. It is improper to give the petition and counter-petition together: And it is too late to give the counter-petition afterwards."—Indeed! This puts one in mind of the witty advice of Sir Francis Bacon concerning the proper age to marry: "A young man not yet; an old man never."

But, Sir Fletcher, you must answer for this conduct to the House, if their spirit is equal to the surprise and indignation of some of the members who knew the contents of

the two petitions, and intended to speak to them; but who by their surprise and modesty were prevented (when they found too late what was done) from calling the Speaker to an immediate account for his conduct.

The petition of Mr. De Gray and his Brother the Chief-justice (whose conduct, in a series of tricking and high-handed injustice, shall be hereafter fully examined) was thus smuggled through the House on Monday the 7th. The bill will be read for the first time on Thursday the 10th, for the second time, on Monday the 14th, and finally passed on Monday the 21st of this Month.

And thus, with the connivance of such a Speaker, may the right and property of any private gentleman in this kingdom be, *in a fortnight*, transferred to another by the House of Commons even without its own knowledge; whilst the lawful, unoffending, owner may be on a voyage to the continent, or even on a journey to Yorkshire, and find on his return his lands and property exchanged and transferred; without having any notice or suspicion of the attempt, till after it hath taken place. These are the facts.

And

And now, Sir Fletcher, I return to you.
 —Do you think it improper that the representative of a county, having, according to his duty, promised to present a petition for one person, should likewise present a petition for another; and thus, as far as he can, give both an opportunity of equal justice, by affordidg his weight and countenance to neither, till the merits shall have been heard, and justice determined him?

What, not if he is totally unacquainted with the merits of either petition?

What, not if the first requires some benefit, in which another man's property is concerned, to be granted him by Parliament (who are the guardians of rights, not the dispensers of favours or the deciders of particulars causes;) whilst the second Petitioner asks no favour, but barely requests that his property may not be taken from him?

What, not if the representative has reason to suspect that the first petition may be unreasonable?

What, not if he even knows that the first request is an injustice?

Since when, Sir Fletcher, has the first applyer had this advantage, in your opinion,
 over

over all that come after ? It is well known that after having received fees for your venal tongue, when it was openly let out for hire, you did not always faithfully observe this rule.

But you say it is unusual and extraordinary ! You know the contrary, and that it is frequently done ; almost every sessions ; certainly in the last, and in the present. You know not to mention others, that the petitions concerning the *Selby* navigation, now depending, were delivered for both sides by the same person.

But a grosser falsehood than this was contained in your artful question to Sir Edward.—“ Did the gentleman ask you to deliver his counter-petition ? ” You knew he did ; and that Sir Edward not only told you so, but consulted you upon it. How dared you to insult the honest member and mock the house, whilst you were ensnaring and prejudicing them by such a question ? If Sir Edward had not consulted you upon it before, yet he had told you, the very preceding moment, that he was desired so to do. But if he had not said so, was the information necessary ? Do members of that house present petitions in other men’s names without
being

being asked by them? And yet had you the assurance twice to repeat the same *false question* with a sneer. Perhaps, with your usual modesty of Chicane, you will answer that a *question* cannot contain a falsehood. Let this instance confound such mean subterfuge: your question conveyed intelligibly to those who heard it, that you knew not the fact of which you asked to be informed. And the real motive of your question was, to cast before-hand a ridicule and prejudice both upon him who made, and him who presented the counter-petition.

But your last declaration was a falsehood, whose motive should degrade you from the chair. You knew the substance of both the petitions, and the uncommon circumstances which attended them. And because you knew they were *not common*, and were fearful that their *uncommonness* should alarm the house; in order to defeat the counter-petition of even a hearing, and to prevent the attention of the house, you had the baseness to declare aloud, that "It was only a common petition for a common inclosure." If so, why did you on Friday direct Sir Edward to delay it for a *fuller house*?

However,

However, your tricks succeeded. The House took their Speaker's word : heard not a tittle of what passed : and, as a mere matter of the most common and trifling form, suffered you to pass (by yourself, without their knowing even that the question was put, and without one single *Aye* or *No* being given on the occasion) a question concerning private property, without the smallest pretence of public benefit or convenience ; except perhaps that as the consequence to Mr. De Grey will be near a thousand a-year profit, it may save the ministry the expence of a pension ; and serve as a precedent to confer similar rewards on the creatures of the court at the expence of the honest country gentlemen who oppose them.

Sir, I will venture to say that a Speaker who knew the circumstances as you did, would have been a traitor to the trust reposed in him by that House, if he had suffered such an affair to pass over without calling for their attention to what was doing. But if, as you did, he should divert that attention, which they were ready and beginning to give ; and should by an explicit, wilful falsehood, like yours, direct them *not to attend to it* ;—such a Speaker should

should be punished with more than degradation. Although by so knavish a management he had contrived, contraay to justice, to confer a favour on a creature of administration, the brother of a Chief-Justice, and a connection of Lord Boston.

Sir, I am free to acknowledge that such language as this I hold to you, and in such a disreputable channel, should not in a policed nation be suffered even to a private individual, much less to the first great officer of the people. But, alas! we are not a policed nation; for the laws have lost their edge towards the guilty, and are no longer the refuge of the innocent. You are not the officer of the people; for though you bear that respected and awful name, yet yourself and all others know that you owe your situation to the corrupt influence of that accursed plan of power, which has left us no right but that of lamentation. This right I will freely exercise in this country, until the tongue shall cleave to the roof of the mouth. All sorts of punishment, I know, are at the discretion of your employers; and, according to their fancy or policy, they will, when they please, inflict it. But I shall think myself well rewarded, if I can only awaken from their lethargy

thargy some few honest members of the House of Commons, to watch over the wickedness which you are daily perpetrating under the pretence of form.

And whatever happens to myself, I will say, with the patient Greck of old,

STRIKE—but HEAR.

The following are genuine copies of the two Petitions alluded to. Those who read them will be able to form a judgment of the Speaker's worth :

To the Honorable the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of THOMAS DE GREY, Esquire, Lord of the Manor of Tottington, in the County of Norfolk, and of several Owners and Proprietors of Lands within the Parish of Tottington.

SHEWETH,

THAT there are within the said Parish of Tottington several common lands, consisting of common fields, half year lands, common pastures, common meadows,

dows, and lammas meadows; and also several commons, commonable lands, heaths, or waste grounds belonging to your petitioners, which in their present state are inconveniently situated for the owners, and incapable of any considerable improvement.

That if the said Lands were divided and allotted to your Petitioners, and all persons interested therein, according to their respective rights and interests, the same would be greatly improved.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray this Honorable House that leave may be given to bring in a bill for dividing and inclosing the said lands and grounds, in such manner and under such regulations as this House shall think proper.

WM. SMITH, for Balls, a minor.

CLEM. WACE, } Trustees for Robert

THO. BARTON, } Knoptwood, a minor

JOHN FROAST.

THOMAS DE GREY.

WM. CLOUGH, Vicar.

WM. DE GREY.

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of WILLIAM TOOKE, Esquire, a Proprietor of Lands in the Parish of Tottington, in the County of Norfolk, in Behalf of himself and several other Owners and Proprietors of Lands within the said Parish of Tottington.

SHEWETH,

THAT your petitioner hath been very recently informed that a petition would be presented to this Honourable House in the name of Thomas De Grey, Esquire, lord of the manor of Tottington, in the county of Norfolk, and of several owners and proprietors of lands within the parish of Tottington; setting forth, that if certain common lands, consisting of common fields, half-year lands, common pastures, common meadows and lammas meadows, and also several commons, commonable lands, heaths, or waste grounds, within the said parish were divided and allotted to all persons interested therein, *according to their respective rights and interests*, the same would be greatly improved.

That

That your petitioner, and a great part of the owners and proprietors of lands within the said parish, have not consented to the above application for dividing, inclosing, &c. Which they have reason to believe is solely intended for the great gain and emolument of the said Thomas De Grey, Esquire, to the great injury and detriment of your petitioner, and other owners and proprietors of lands within the said parish.

That the said Thomas De Grey, Esquire, hath already made many and great Encroachments upon the commons of the said Parish, in violation of the lawful rights and estates of your petitioner, and other owners of lands.

That your petitioner apprehends that the said petition for dividing, inclosing, and allotting the said lands, is not only intended to deprive your petitioner, and other owners, of their legal remedy against the said encroachments on and violation of their lawful rights and estates; but the said encroachments, &c. will be urged as claims to a much larger proportion in the proposed allotments of lands, than the said Thomas De Grey, Esquire, would otherwise be lawfully intitled to.

That,

That, as your petitioner is informed, and verily believes, no previous public notice, by advertisement or otherwise, has been given by the said Thomas De Gray, or any other person, for a public meeting of the proprietors and owners of lands, within the said parish of Tottington, to be held for the purpose of considering the subject matter of the said petition of the said Thomas De Grey, Esquire; but that the said application to this Honourable House for the inclosure of the said common lands, &c. of the parish of Tottington is made precipitately and partially, contrary, as your petitioner apprehends, to the usual method in applications to this Honourable House on similar occasions; the first notice of any design to apply to this Honourable House for an inclosure, having been very lately given to your petitioner by one of the officers of this Honourable House, who was employed to prepare the said petition.

That there can be no reasonable pretence, either of private damage from delay, or of public benefit by acceleration, for a hasty and immediate progress in the bill petitioned for by the said Thomas De Grey, Esquire.

That

That your petitioner resides at the distance of One hundred miles from the said parish of Tottington.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays this Honourable House, that sufficient and convenient time may be granted to him and the other owners and proprietors of lands within the said parish of Tottington, to be prepared and ready to make good their objections to the said petition of the said Thomas De Grey, Esquire.

And that the disputed rights of common between the said Thomas De Grey, Esquire, and your petitioner, and other owners of land within the said parish, may be first duly settled and determined by a jury, according to the laws of the land, before leave be given by this Honourable House to bring in a bill for the inclosing, dividing, and allotting of lands, *according to those respective rights.* Your petitioner humbly and faithfully assuring this Honourable House, that there shall be no delay on his part, in bringing the said encroachments and usurpations of the said Thomas De Grey, Esquire, to a speedy, final, legal issue.

WILLIAM TOOKE.

T H E
SUBSTANCE of the DEBATE
ON THE
PRECEEDING LETTER,

On FRIDAY, FEBRUARY II, 1774.

THIS day the house waited for the Speaker, there being three hundred members at least present before he took the chair, which was precisely at Three o'clock.

SIR FLETCHER NORTON.

I am extremely loth to take up the time of the house on any matter which immediately relates to myself. Yet as the investigation of it nearly concerns my honour, I am under the necessity of craving your indulgence. I have one of the Honourable Gentlemen in my eye, (Sir Edward Astley) who may have it in his power to give the necessary explanations, the two others (Messrs. Sawbridge and Oliver) I perceive are not yet come, I shall, therefore, in the mean time, proceed with the business of the House for half an hour, hoping that by that time, either one, or both of them, may make their appearance.

In the interim, several bills were presented and petitions received, when, on Mr. Sawbridge's arrival, the Speaker said, That is the Gentleman I waited for; and the House in an instant was Silence itself.

SIR FLETCHER NORTON.

I have been charged with a crime, which, if true, I should be unworthy of the Honourable Seat I now occupy, or, indeed, of sitting withid these
D walls.

walls. If it was only personal scurrility, or even general charges, I should not trouble this House; I should look on them equally unworthy your notice and mine; but it relates to a matter which is supposed to have passed here, and that too in the very Honourable Station I now fill. What makes it still more serious is, that it refers to a series of facts, which, as connected with my present situation, could not have happened without my knowledge, and which I can affirm solemnly I am totally a stranger to, further than the general transient knowledge I may have of matters of a similar nature. It is a letter in a public paper of this day, signed, "*Strike, but hear,*" published by H. S. Woodfall. Without entering into the substance of the whole, it contains, it charges me with a predilection for Mr. De Grey, in the progress of the Tottington Inclosing Bill: than which, nothing could be more remote from my intention. I do not so much as know the Gentleman alluded to, further than seeing him in this House; and as for his brother, the Chief Justice, who is one of the parties to the bill, I am sure I have not the least personal intercourse with. I can with justice say, that as well on this, as every other occasion of the same kind, I have always acted with the strictest impartiality, nor does any thing rest on my mind relative to the matter, but that I thought yesterday, as it was litigated, Counsel should be permitted to be heard at the second reading. As to the rest, I trust to the recollection of the Gentlemen immediately concerned in the transaction.

Sir Edward Ashley spoke for a considerable time in discussion of Sir Fletcher, but so low that it was impossible to hear distinctly what he said. He however, denied all the facts charged in the letter which referred to himself, and concluded by taking the blame, as being guilty of a blunder.

MR.

MR. SAWBRIDGE.

The only knowledge I have of this business was the day the Honourable Gentleman who spoke last presented both petitions, when I thought it somewhat extraordinary, that the same person should present them, as one of them prayed for the bringing in a bill which the other prayed should not be brought in. As to the part I took yesterday in this business, it was merely on an application made to me, the preceding day, on account of the member's absence in the country, who was to have presented it. On neither day did I perceive any foundation for the charge now made. If I imagined that the Honourable Member, against whom the letter alluded to is directed, was guilty of any partiality, I should not in the least hesitate to complain to the House of him, but I never have had the least foundation for any such complaint, as he has always acted with all the candour I could possibly desire.

He was followed by Colonel Jennings and Sir John Turner, who confirmed the sentiments of their leaders, the latter of whom bestowed on Sir Fletcher the highest encomiums.

SIR FLETCHER NORTON.

The only motives which induced me to give the House this trouble being now fully answered, I have no wish that any further notice should be taken of it; the evidence of my innocence, and the approbation of my conduct, being all I had in view when I took up this business; that being fully attained, I am perfectly easy as to the scurrility and falsehoods contained in this scandalous libel.

The House now remained in a state of inaction for near two minutes, when Mr. Herbert moved that Henry Sampson Woodfall, Publisher of the Public Advertiser, be ordered to attend at the bar of this House on Monday morning next. He prefaced his motion, with the atrociousness of the offence, a strenuous

D a avowal

avowal of the privileges of the House and the necessity there was for the most formidable interposition in behalf of their Speaker.

SIR JOSEPH MAWBEY.

How much soever deserving of punishment I may think the person, against whom this motion is intended, I can by no means subscribe to the mode now proposed. We cannot forget the fate of the last contest of a similar nature, the same consequences, in my opinion, ought to be avoided. Our orders will be probably contemned, and one sure consequence we may expect, is, to throw the people into a flame.

LORD FOLKSTONE.

I cannot avoid condemning, in the strongest terms, the publication alluded to; but, for the reasons assigned by the worthy Member who spoke last, and others no less cogent, I think it would be much more eligible to address his Majesty, that he would be pleased to order his Attorney-General to prosecute him.

MR. C. FOX.

One Honourable Gentleman thinks it would be better that the affair were dropped, because the Right Hon. Person injured has expressed a wish that it might, and because it may be productive of a quarrel with the City of London: the former can be no reason, because it ought not induce us to give up our own privileges; and, as to the latter, it is well known, that if people be pre-disposed to quarrel, they can never want an opportunity to create one. If spitting in your face will not determine you to resent, they may proceed to blows, and at last trample on you. As to the proposition of the Noble Lord, it is pretty much the same thing as if we were to petition his Majesty to protect us, his slaves, dependants, pensioners, and creatures, from the citizens of London, not being able to protect ourselves. On the whole, I heartily second the motion, and hope we shall not relax or desert, as on a former Occasion, but

but unite as one man in enforcing it to the full extent.

LORD NORTH.

If a flame is to be the consequence of our asserting our just rights and privileges, the sooner it shall break out the better, that we may no longer be in doubt what these are. I already foresee all the professional steps of this business; the Printer will refuse to attend, he will be taken into custody, our officer will be committed, and some worthy alderman, if any can be found, will share the same fate, and, in turn, will be sure to purchase popularity. On a former occasion two gentlemen were committed to the tower. One of them failed in his expectations, the other, a very respectable magistrate, has had the good fortune to be reviled by the very persons, whose rights he was supposed to have asserted, with every calumny and abuse that malice or faction could invent. All I can add on this head is, that if any should be found emulous of such honours, I wish they may meet with a similar reward.

MR. SAWBRIDGE.

If I were present in the city at the time the Noble Lord alludes to, I should have acted just in the same manner those Gentlemen did; regardless of the popularity he speaks of and the other circumstances accompanying it, or the resentment of this House. If, on the present occasion, it should fall to my lot, I shall cheerfully submit to it: because I would look upon it as suffering for the faithful discharge of my duty. And, if called upon, therefore, though no man is fonder of liberty, nor has less inclination to go into a prison, yet in the defence of the legal rights of my fellow-citizens, I shall gladly embrace the opportunity of standing up in their defence. The courts of law are open for redress; I can therefore never consent to a mode of prosecution and punishment so utterly repugnant to the true principles of the constitution.

Mr.

MR. DOWDESWELL.

I can retain no doubt that the House is fully justified in the motion now proposed, and cannot be too tenacious in defending and protecting their own privileges, and enforcing a due obedience to their orders. Nor could there be a question at this time of day concerning it, but for their own act, and for the consequent weakness and disrepute it has brought on them. It is the light they stand in with the people, that could bring such a matter into dispute. This does not proceed from the clamours of a mob or a rabble, but is founded on the deliberate opinions of those most conversant in the constitution of their country.

MR. JENKISON.

I suppose the matter the Right Honourable Gentleman means, is the affair of the Middlesex Election. But supposing we were wrong in that decision, are we to be so in every thing else? Though I always thought, and shall ever continue of the same mind, that we have done nothing on that occasion, but what we are fully justified in.

SIR WILLIAM MEREDITH.

We are told, both within and without doors, that our constitution is gone. Yet, such as it is, must not we abide by the forms of it, till another is substituted in its stead.

MR. DEMPSTER.

My intimate knowledge of our worthy Speaker, who has been thus basely and falsely calumniated, I think calls for another mode of proceeding than the one now proposed; for, supposing the motion now made should be passed without further notice, in what manner will it appear on the face of our proceedings? Not a syllable relative to his innocence. I should therefore think that previous to any other resolution, we should pass a vote expressive of our sense of his innocence, and of the malignity of the libel in which he has been aspersed. As to the motion already made, I do by no means approve

prove of it. There is no country in Europe, where redress for every species of private injury is so readily attained as in this ; and as to public characters, this right of scrutinizing into their conduct, is one of the prime checks to enforce the due execution of their respective offices ; and even here we have had a recent instance of a first Lord of the Admiralty being done ample justice to by an English Jury.

Mr. Herbert then withdrew his former motion to introduce that of Mr. Dempster ; and it was

Resolved, *nemine contradicente*, That a Letter, signed "*Strike, but bear,*" in the Public Advertiser of this day, was a false, atrocious, and scandalous libel on Sir Fletcher Norton, Speaker of this House. Then followed Mr. Herbert's.

Resolved, That H. S. Woodfall, publisher of the Public Advertiser. do attend at the bar of this House on Monday morning next.

(36)

The image is a scan of a document page that is extremely faded and blurry. The text is illegible. The layout appears to be a standard page with multiple lines of text, possibly a list or a series of paragraphs. There are some faint, dark spots that might be remnants of ink or scanning artifacts.

5-0459

5-0059

